

Application No.: 10/803,551

Docket No.: 03-4027

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 8, and 12 are independent claims. No claims are amended or canceled herein. In the Office Action, all pending claims were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. 6,038,560 ("Wical"). For the reasons set forth below, the foregoing claim rejections are respectfully traversed. Moreover, Applicant reserves the right to present, in subsequent papers, reasons not set forth herein supporting the patentability of his claims, and also to argue for the separate patentability of dependent claims not explicitly addressed in this paper.

I. Claim 1**A. "parsing statements from at least one Semantic Web structured resource . . ."**

Claim 1 recites in part "parsing statements from at least one Semantic Web structured resource to identify component words." The Office Action (page 1) asserted that Wical anticipates this recitation by disclosing that "a word match-based search and retrieval system [in response to a query] parses [a] repository of information to locate a match by comparing the words of the query to words of documents in the repository." (Wical, column 1: 26-29.) However, simply "comparing the words of the query to words of documents in the repository" does not teach or suggest "parsing statements from at least one Semantic Web structured resource." For at least this reason, Wical does not anticipate claim 1.

Wical contains no teaching or suggestion that its documents are "structured resources," much less "parsing statements from at least one Semantic Web structured resource to identify component words," and in fact teaches against this recitation in claim 1. That is, Wical discloses "a content processing system [that] processes a plurality of documents to identify themes for a document, and classifies the documents, including themes identified for the documents, and categories of [a] knowledge base." (Wical, column 2: 63-67.) Wical contains no teaching or suggestion that its documents are structured in any way. Instead, "the content processing system analyzes the semantic, contextual, and stylistic aspects of the documents, and generates a document theme vector." (Wical, column 5: 44-46.) If the documents of Wical were structured resources, or included "statements from at least one Semantic Web structured resource," then Wical would have

Application No.: 10/803,551

Docket No.: 03-4027

no reason to analyze “the semantic, contextual, and stylistic aspects” of documents. Conversely, Wical’s analysis of “the semantic, contextual, and stylistic aspects” of documents would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that Semantic Web structured resources were unnecessary.

Accordingly, Wical not only fails to anticipate claim 1, but teaches against at least the foregoing recitation of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1, as well as claims 2-5 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the foregoing reasons.

B. “obtaining predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values of said related ones of said statements”

Independent claim 1 recites in part “obtaining predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values of said related ones of said statements.” The Office Action (page 1) asserted that Wical anticipates this recitation by disclosing categories of documents provided in response to a search query. (Wical, column 4: 45-62.) The Examiner further cited Wical’s Figures 8 and 9, which likewise merely show categories of documents. In fact, neither the cited portions of Wical nor any other teach or suggest “predicates,” “instances,” or “types of said instances,” together with “literal values of said related ones of said statements” as is recited in claim 1. If the next Office Action asserts that Wical teaches the foregoing recitation of claim 1, the Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically identify respective elements in Wical that read on each of “predicates,” “instances,” “types of said instances,” and “literal values of said related ones of said statements.” Applicant does not believe that Wical discloses such elements, much less teaches or suggests “obtaining” such elements, in any way.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1, as well as claims 2-5 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

II. Claim 5

A. “visiting sites on a network to identify Semantic Web structured resources”

Independent claim 5 recites in part “visiting sites on a network to identify Semantic Web structured resources.” However, the portions of Wical cited in the Office Action (page 2) as allegedly addressing this claim limitation include merely the teaching of “comparing the words of the query to words of documents in the repository” discussed above with reference to claim 1, and the teaching of assigning relevancy criteria to documents. (Wical, column 26: 23-40.) As discussed

Application No.: 10/803,551

Docket No.: 03-4027

above with regard to claim 1, Wical contains no teaching or suggestion of "Semantic Web structured resources." Moreover, Wical clearly contains no teaching or suggestion of "visiting sites on a network to identify" any type of structured resources at all.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 5, as well as claims 6-7 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

B. "gathering statements from said Semantic Web structured resources;"

Independent claim 5 recites in part "gathering statements from said Semantic Web structured resources." The Office Action (page 3) asserted that Wical anticipates this recitation by teaching "the potential existence of documents [responsive to a query] by displaying terminology related to the query." (Wical, column 2: 43-46; *see also* column 2: 47-53.) In fact, as noted above, Wical includes no teaching or suggestion of structured resources, much less "Semantic Web structured resources" at all. Further, the cited portion of Wical discloses nothing more than displaying terms from a knowledge base, and has nothing at all to do with gathering statements, much less gathering information of any kind from documents, much less structured resources.

Accordingly, for least the foregoing reasons, claim 5, as well as claims 6-7 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

III. Claim 8

At least for reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Wical does not teach or suggest the recitations in independent claim 8 of "at least one parser receiving statements from Semantic Web structured resources and identifying component words of said statements" and "a servlet for obtaining predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values of said statements related to said matched words." Therefore, at least for these reasons, claim 8, as well as claims 9-11 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

IV. Claim 12

At least for reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Wical does not teach or suggest the recitations in independent claim 12 of instructions for causing a processor to "parse statements from at least one Semantic Web structured resource to identify component words" and "obtain predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values of said related ones of said

Application No.: 10/803,551

Docket No.: 03-4027

statements." Therefore, at least for these reasons, claim 12, as well as claims 13-15 depending therefrom, are allowable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

All rejections have been addressed. In view of the above, the presently pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. It is believed that any fees associated with the filing of this paper are identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Account 18-0013, under order number 65632-0218. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged against the aforementioned account.

Dated: January 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles A. Bieneman

Registration No.: 51,472

Michael B. Stewart

Registration No.: 36,018

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 25537

Attorneys for Applicant